24th February 1934]

(b) if so, what action the Government have taken or propose to take on the same?

A.—(a) Copies of resolutions passed on the subject at certain public meetings and by some of the local bodies in the district have been received by the Government.

(b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to G.O. No. 2254, Revenue, dated 15th December 1933, and G.O. No. 72, Revenue, dated 10th January 1934, which have been made available to the Press. In addition to these concessions the ryots will receive those admissible under Board's Standing Order No. 13.

Alteration of the kistbandi in the Ganjam district.

* 683 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the average prices of paddy according to reports received by the Government prevailing in the district of Ganjam in each of the years 1930, 1931, 1932 and 1933 from 1st January to 30th June per garce; and

(b) whether the Government have considered the prayers of the People's Association, Ganjam, and the Association of Ryotwari Landholders of Ghumsur Division to change the dates of kistbandi from December to March?

A.—(a) The prices of paddy (second sort) in the Ganjam district (Littoral, i.e., areas other than Agency) were as follows:—

		PER GARCE. RS.
1st January to 30th June 1930 ...	...	246·9
,, ,, 1931 ...	...	185·5
,, ,, 1932 ...	...	161·3
,, ,, 1933 ...	...	152·2

(b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answers given to question No. 749 on 23rd March 1933 and question No. 603 on 2nd February 1934. The requests referred to were that the kistbandi should be so revised that the first kist might begin in February instead of in December. As the Government decided in June 1932 that no alteration in the kistbandi of the Ganjam district was
no alteration in the kistbandi of the Ganjam district was

Representations from South Kanara for the postponement of the resettlement operations.

* 684 Q.—Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) how many representations and proceedings of public meetings have been received by the Government from South Kanara to postpone the resettlement and not to enhance the rates of assessment; and

[24th February 1934

(b) whether the Government have taken any action on them?

A.—(a) A number of representations on the subject have been received. The Government cannot easily state the exact number.

(b) The request contained in the representations referred to will be borne in mind when the scheme report for the resettlement of the South Kanara district is taken up for consideration.

Assignment of land on dharkast to members of the Depressed Classes in Tinnevelly during the year 1933.

* 685 *Q.*—Mr. M. DEVADASAN: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) how many applications were addressed to the Revenue authorities by the Depressed Classes for the assignment of lands on dharkast in the year 1933 in the district of Tinnevelly;

(b) how many of them were disposed of and how many are kept still pending;

(c) how many of the applications have been allowed;

(d) what the total extent of land assigned to the depressed classes in the year 1933 is;

(e) in how many cases Depressed Class applicants have been asked to pay value for the lands assigned; and

(f) whether it is true that the Depressed Classes have been asked to pay valuable consideration for the lands assigned in the village of Maranthai long after the assignment and occupation; if so, why?

A.—The Government have not the information but have called for it.

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—" Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to place the report on the table of the House as soon as it is received? "

The Hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" The hon. Member's request will be considered on receipt of the report."

Alienation by Government of land in Melapalayam for the location of a market.

* 686 *Q.*—Rao Sahib N. SIVA RAJ: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether any piece of land was alienated by the Government in Melapalayam within the municipal limits of Palamcottah for the location of a market;

(b) if so, when it was done; and

(c) whether any market was located as proposed by the municipality of Palamcottah?

A.—The Government have not the information but have called for it.